9. My company has developed computer-based games that are available commercially. Accurate simulations underlie our gaming environment, so that our products are true simulators, not merely games. We believe they may be extremely useful for education, training, and perhaps tactical development and evaluation. Under this BAA, would the Navy / Marine Corps be interested in funding their own specific versions of these products?

A9: In general, games or simulations would be of interest provided they meet the goals, objectives, and characteristics outlined in Section 6 of the announcement, particularly 6.1.3 through 6.1.5. However, proposed work should involve the development of advanced technology, not merely adaptation of available techniques.   In addition, since many games and simulations are based on a "discovery learning" approach to instruction, they are less likely to be successful or efficient in training, unless there is a strong focus on the tasks to be trained, task performance measurement, assessment, and diagnostic or instructive feedback. Further, for simulations to be successfully applied in training, performance predictions for sensors, weapons, and platforms must properly implement validated physics models and approved databases of input parameters. Simulations must properly model all major physical phenomena known to affect sensor / weapon / platform performance in real-world operations. In general, the models and databases should be verified and validated by the appropriate Navy or Marine Corps activity, for example, the Office of Naval Intelligence, Oceanographer of the Navy, etc. Performance prediction and visualization systems must by usable by experienced operators and tacticians so as to provide support through major phases of their tactical tasks, including planning, search, and prosecution. The implementation of user interfaces in the simulations should add little additional complexity to operator and tactician tasks.

10. Is the training of Navy medics a priority under this BAA ?

A10: There is no special priority for any particular job category.   Training for medical personnel would certainly be of interest.

11. How should the cost of government personnel who might be included on a proposed team be handled? Should the proposed budget cover their participation or would they be supported under their regular funding?

A11:   Budgets for government personnel depend on the accounting system used at their employing activity. For those activities that use a working capital fund or similar reimbursable accounting system, then their salaries, overhead, G&A, travel, etc. should be included in the cost proposal. This includes many labs and warfare centers.   For government personnel from "mission-funded" activities such as fleet commands, and all uniformed personnel, the budget would normally not include salaries, but would include

overhead, travel, etc. Please check with the comptroller at the employing activity for specific information. If the work is funded, ONR will issue funds directly to participating government activities, so no "pass-through" charges should be included.

12. Who is the incumbent for this effort?

A12. It should be understood that a BAA is not the same as a solicitation. The definition of a BAA can be found at FAR 35.016. To summarize, a BAA describes an agency's research interests in broadly defined areas. For example: One contractor might submit a proposal that fits within the scope of work under the BAA for laser development, and another contractor could submit a proposal that fits within the same scope, but it deals with hydrodynamic technologies. The odds of two contractors proposing the same technology (while possible) is very rare under a BAA.

A solicitation prepared and announced on FedBizOpps asks contractors to submit quotes or proposals based on the agency's specified needs – in other words, all contractors will bid/quote on the same items.

So, back to the question – what could an incumbent contractor tell proposing contractors? Because the competition is based on the proposed technology and **_not_** similar requirements, an incumbent to this effort might not divulge any information pertaining to technology or costs.

Awards were made in 2002; however, not all awards were made from ONR (per the technical program officer). Below is a partial list of awardees that ONR was able to pull together in order to quickly respond to the requests for awardees:

Navy Labs:
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division
Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center, San Diego
Navy Personnel Research, Studies, and Technology Center, Millington TN
Naval Research Laboratory
Naval Air Warfare Center, Orlando FL
Naval Post-Graduate School
NASA Ames

Universities:
UCLA
Clemson Univ.
Univ. of Texas at Austin, ARL
Penn State Univ.
Univ. of Southern California
UC Santa Barbara
Univ Central Florida

Univ. of Michigan
Carnegie Mellon Univ.
Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Johns Hopkins Univ APL
George Washington Univ.
Univ. of Tennessee
Univ. of Mississippi
Univ. of Missouri
Univ. of Colorado at Boulder
Southern Methodist University
Auburn University

Industry:
ESI
SAG
DynCorp
American Institutes for Research
RCII
CHI systems Inc.
Klein Associates
SAIC
Lockheed Martin
Anteon Corp

VRsonic
CellExchange
EDS
Intersense
IBM
SCCI
PSE
KAT
SoarTech
Visitech
Design Interactive
Sonalysts
Computer Sciences Corp.